

WILKINSON) BARKER) KNAUER) LLP

1800 M STREET, NW
SUITE 800N
WASHINGTON, DC 20036
TEL 202.783.4141
FAX 202.783.5851
WWW.WBKLaw.COM
L. CHARLES KELLER
DIRECT 202.383.3414
CKELLER@WBKLAW.COM

February 13, 2017

VIA ECFS

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: *Notice of Ex Parte Presentation - Mobility Fund Phase II (WT Docket No. 10-208; WC Docket No. 10-90)*

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On February 9, 2017, ATN International, Inc., (“ATN”) on behalf of itself and its subsidiaries Choice Communications, LLC, NTUA Wireless, LLC, and Commnet Wireless, LLC (“ATN”) met with Rachel Bender from the Office of Chairman Pai to discuss Mobility Fund Phase II in the above-referenced proceedings. On February 7, 2017, the same companies met with the staff of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau and the Wireline Competition Bureau copied below. In both meetings, ATN was represented by Douglas Minster, Vice President, Government and Regulatory Affairs, ATN; Rohan Ranaraja, Director, Regulatory Affairs, ATN; and undersigned counsel. In the February 7 meeting, Messrs. Minster and Ranaraja appeared by teleconference. In the meeting with Ms. Bender, Lou Tomasetti, President, Commnet Wireless, LLC also attended. Our presentation in the meetings followed the attached slides, which were given to the attendees.

Sincerely,

/s/ L. Charles Keller
L. Charles Keller

cc: Rachel Bender
Jim Schlichting
Ryan Palmer
Alexander Minard
Charles Eberle

Mobility Fund Phase II

ATN International, Inc.
Choice Communications, LLC
NTUA Wireless, LLC
Commnet Wireless, LLC

February 2017



choice



ATN Supports the Joint Proposal with AT&T and Blue Wireless

- Move forward without delay
- Award support through reverse auction
- Focus on areas without existing LTE coverage
 - Set out clear and objective process for perfecting coverage data
- Clearly establish performance and accountability standards for auction winners
 - Standards should be based as much as possible on successful approaches from CAF experience.
- Size the fund based on reasonable estimate of cost to complete 4G LTE deployment

Coverage Data Improvement Process

- To prove that an area lacks LTE coverage, parties must provide:
 - Proof of lack of 5 Mbps service based on objective testing using either standard drive test equipment or commercial speed test app, and
 - Map of CBs or partial CBs challenged showing test locations.

Bidding Unit

- Bidding unit should be road miles because roads best capture the purpose of a mobile fund:
 - Consumers' ability to access mobile service while driving is critical to economic development and public safety.
 - Places where people live, work, and travel, as well as other relevant geography (e.g., agricultural land), are generally served by roads.
- The second-best alternative bidding unit would be geography (per the joint proposal).
- Under no circumstances should the fund be based on pops.
 - A pops-based fund would not be a true mobility fund – it would leave both roads and agricultural lands unserved.
 - Another fund (CAF) is focused on residential/business fixed locations; the Mobility Fund should not just subsidize a duplicative network.

Fund Size

- Fund should be based on reasonable estimate of funding needed to complete construction of 4G networks in unserved areas.
- Estimate depends on bidding unit
 - Road miles: ATN previously filed its estimate that serving unserved road miles would cost about \$2.3B total.
 - Estimate based on per-road-mile construction costs from mid-range of winning MF1 bids, excluding high-end outliers.
 - Geography: Joint proposal includes AT&T's estimate that covering unserved geography would cost \$8B - \$18B total.
 - Estimate based on presumed area served per tower and assumed cost to site or upgrade towers to provide 5/1 LTE service.
 - Other key factors: term of support; final coverage requirement

Government Lands

- Parties to joint proposal agree that it may be difficult or impossible to provide service on some state and federal lands.
 - Carriers on some gov't lands experience difficulty in siting towers, gaining access to rights-of-way for backhaul, and geographic challenges, and some lands are so remote that no service is warranted.
 - Some gov't lands are important to serve (e.g., Nat'l Parks).
- ATN believes bidders must be able to bid on government lands where they believe service can and should be provided.
- Options for addressing government lands:
 - Pre-auction process to consider whether service is appropriate in particular gov't lands and make in-or-out decision, *or*
 - Option for bidders to include gov't lands or not, with appropriate additional weight for bids that include gov't lands (which are likely to be substantially more costly to serve).